

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IX, No. 14

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

September 1, 1979

## HEW to Continue with Califano's R&D Plan

The comprehensive research-planning system that Joe Califano was trying to install at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was far from complete when he was abruptly dismissed in July.

But what ought to be noted is that the first phase of this huge enterprise—devising a set of basic “health research principles” (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 17) for HEW’s multi-billion-dollar R&D activities—has been accomplished. Furthermore, Califano’s successor, Patricia Harris, has been briefed on the principles by the high command of the National Institutes of Health, and they came away with the impression that she wants the planning exercise to keep rolling along.

However, where it’s rolling, and to what effect, is extremely difficult to foresee in the peculiar politics of biomedical research. On the one hand, the “principles”—released by Califano on August 2, the day before he left office—can be regarded as no more than a collec-

tion of the biomedical sciences. “Never before,” he said, “have the health agencies in HEW been asked to coordinate their programs and budgets.” Without explaining the cause of this deficiency, Califano went on to state that “it is a necessary process if HEW is to meet challenges ranging from immediate problems, such as Legionnaires disease, to long-range issues, such as toxic chemicals whose effects may not be evident for 20 years or more.”

The more difficult challenge, but one that he did not mention, are the enduring differences between the legislative and executive branches on the care and feeding of the biomedical research enterprise. In fact, it was Califano’s failure to show any enthusiasm for Carter’s attempts to hold down biomedical spending that contributed strongly to that White House parnoia about the HEW Secretary’s “loyalty” to the Administration.

Thus, while the Administration was publicly congratulating itself about its good works in behalf of the  
(Continued on Page 2)

### Administration Outlines

### \$800 Million in Auto R&D---Page 6

tion of windy platitudes; on the other, these same principles, if deftly exploited by biomedical politicians, could give NIH and its clients considerable protection against the disruptive ups and downs of recent years, as well as the much-yearned-for fiscal predictability that has eluded biomedical research through many administrations.

With the principles down on paper, the Califano-initiated planning exercise now goes into a stage which is considerably less abstract than the previous 18 months of phrase honing. This second stage calls for analyzing HEW’s major research activities—proposed and underway—for Fiscal 1980.

Among the topics that will be examined are: smoking and behavior, HEW’s toxicology programs, population research, the “stabilization” of research grants, and the assessment of health-care technology.

The third stage, assuming the continuation of this exercise beyond the next presidential election, would be the application of the system to the planning of the HEW research budget.

As Califano suggested in a statement accompanying the release of the principles, the very act of getting together the various HEW research agencies and their constituencies represents something new in the adminis-

## In Brief

If military-related expenditures are excluded, R&D spending in the US and the nine-nation European Economic Community are “roughly equal,” according to the EEC publication *Euroforum*. “This is because military R&D expenditures represent 27 per cent of the total in the US, but only 10 per cent in the Community.”

Though Joe Califano’s war on smoking helped add to the pressure that finally brought his ouster from HEW, newly appointed Secretary Patricia Harris has publicly vowed that she’ll carry on with Califano’s anti-tobacco campaign.

Mrs. Harris, still getting briefed and making the rounds of the HEW empire, is tentatively scheduled to visit NIH September 12 to address the staff.

Among unfinished business at HEW: Califano, on his last day in office, issued a blast at the new—and presumably more informative—labeling on the dangerous but popular drug Darvon, produced by Eli Lilly and Co. Califano urged Assistant Secretary of Health Julius Richmond to get Lilly to do it over again, saying that the labeling failed to convey the true dangers of the drug.

## ... Ousted HEW Chief Feared Research Decline

(Continued from Page 1)

American scientific community, the White House last March was treated to the spectacle of its HEW chief going out to the Bethesda campus of NIH and telling an audience of researchers there:

"I am convinced that there is no greater threat to the quality of American life than the slow starvation of our national research enterprise. This threat is all the more dangerous because it is not widely seen and understood. The American people and their leaders should make no mistake about it. We cannot have first-rate science if research facilities are decaying, if opportunities for young scientists are drying up. If we starve science, we sentence this nation to a kind of collective death."

For the purpose of figuring out what Califano had in mind when he inaugurated the great research-planning exercise, it may well be that this ominous assessment is

the best clue. For the essential political fact of "health research principles" is that they presumably represent the collective wisdom of the entire biomedical research community—in government and stretching out to the universities and other institutions. And though there's no electoral political swat to this widely dispersed community, its assessment of what this country needs in biomedical research cannot be easily ignored for penny-pinching purposes.

It is far too early to discern what may endure from Califano's 30 tumultuous months at the helm of HEW. It may be, though, that his main legacy in biomedical research affairs will be a system that, under the label of "planning," gives this research community a great deal more visibility and influence in the political process.

—DSG

## HEW's Health Research Principles

Following is HEW's own summary of the statement of Health Research Principles that it issued last month, plus the complete text of the principles governing fundamental research:

- HEW must encourage and maintain strong, steady support of the search for *fundamental knowledge* necessary to meet the full range of health needs and expectations.

- To improve the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of health care, an appropriate portion of HEW's science activities must be concerned with specific health problems, the *application* of fundamental knowledge to clinical *practice*, and the study of better ways to organize and finance *health services*.

- HEW research must also provide the knowledge that institutions and individuals require to promote health and prevent disease. This includes generation of the basic information that must underlie *government regulations* related to public health.

- Present research *capabilities must be sustained and enhanced* to assure future health gains. Fulfillment of research goals depends on a *community of researchers* working with adequate *resources* in government and private institutions, including colleges and universities medical and other health professional schools, and hospitals, clinics, and laboratories. This research community requires continuous and predictable support from HEW.

- Health research is a universal activity of great significance to all people and to future generations, and HEW research should be *integrated* with that conducted

by other organizations in this country and abroad. The guiding standards for support of health research are *scientific excellence* as judged primarily by peer review, a balancing of *need* and *technical opportunity* for advancing knowledge, and conformance to sound *ethical principles*. To assure that HEW health research is responsive to public concerns, the public must participate in the setting of research policies and priorities.

### FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH

This focus addresses the need for fundamental research (the search for knowledge about fundamental processes of biology and behavior), the creative process that governs this type of research activity, and the role of fundamental research in improving public health and providing the essential knowledge base upon which other Department health missions rely. This focus also encompasses the issue of stability of research support and the relationship of fundamental research to other activities in the health research continuum.

Principle—A national commitment to fundamental research is essential to meet the full range of public health expectations.

- The Federal investment in fundamental research must be maintained to develop the knowledge base essential to support the health research continuum that extends through applied research to the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disorders and diseases and to rehabilitation. This should be recognized as a long-

(Continued on Page 3)

## ***Washington Univ. Gets \$500,000 for Psychic Research Lab***

Washington University, St. Louis, has announced the receipt of a \$500,000 gift from the McDonnell Foundation for the establishment of what's to be known as the McDonnell Laboratory for Psychic Research.

The giver of this sum, in whose honor the lab is named, is James S. McDonnell, chairman of the board of the McDonnell Douglas aerospace combine and a longtime supporter of the University.

An announcement from the University quotes McDonnell as follows:

"Man is approaching the evolutionary point where he is beginning to realize there is a possible merging of matter and mind, and a priority item for current scientific research is the understanding of human consciousness. The exploration of the deep inner space of humankind can challenge intellectually adventurous men and women for generations to come. From these explorations will surely come countless discoveries which in time can make possible human life at higher levels of health, happiness, and creativity."

The press release containing this muddle goes on to state:

"Washington University was selected for this McDonnell Foundation Psychic Research grant, Mr. McDonnell added, because of the dedicated interest in this field by Dr. Peter F. Phillips, Professor of Physics."

The professor, according to the Washington University announcement, formerly was involved in high-energy physics research, which, in turn, "led him to his present search for an 'ether drift.'" The announcement adds that Phillips "has been working in the field of psychic research since 1970, during which time he received a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health to study some aspects of psychokinesis."

William Danforth, Chancellor of the University, is then quoted as saying that McDonnell's gift, following earlier gifts for genetics, biomedical research, and space engineering, "is evidence of his broad-ranging interests."

### **PRINCIPLES** *(Continued from Page 2)*

term investment that provides the freedom for scientists to pursue diverse research topics that may not be immediately relevant to practical health problems or directly targeted to specific health missions.

- This national commitment must include long-term, stable support for fundamental research. This support is essential for the maintenance and strengthening of the scientific knowledge base related to all DHEW health missions.

- The development of new knowledge through fundamental research, and its application, has a significant impact in improving our ability to prevent disease and the effectiveness of treatment and rehabilitation.

- The decision to fund fundamental research in a given area should be based upon an assessment of related ongoing research and new scientific opportunity. The peer review system must be regarded as an efficient and essential instrument in the conduct of research grant programs. The peer review system should be

strengthened.

- Investigator-initiated research proposals must continue to be emphasized in the conduct of fundamental research, and must be restored to their previous prominence as the primary mechanism in the allocation of funds. Additional modes of support are essential and should be utilized when conditions warrant.

- Recognition must be given to a broader concept of health factors and a research base developed to investigate them. This base should include studies in the behavioral sciences and population sciences such as epidemiology and biostatistics, and the physical and chemical sciences and engineering.

- The Directors of NIH and ADAMHA should conduct annual program reviews to update projections and review amounts needed in fundamental research, to identify new areas warranting support, to curtail inappropriate distribution among areas already being supported, to monitor the allocation of resources to fundamental research, and to review the allocation of resources among the various fields.

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1979

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor

**Anne Roark**

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**

European Correspondents  
**Michael Kenward (London)**  
**Francois Seguier (Paris)**

Circulation Manager  
**Alice Anne Freund**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$84.50 (two years, \$149.50); individuals, \$44 (two years, \$75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

## NSF Spots Growth in Academic Part-Time Jobs

The National Science Foundation's latest examination of academic hiring patterns indicates that the big research-oriented universities are continuing to put emphasis on part-timers rather than full-time, tenure-track recruits.

The findings, which dovetail with a study last year by the National Academy of Sciences, suggest that with academic finances stretched thin, universities are finding that it's simpler to take on disposable part-timers than to grapple with the emotional and financial burdens of tenure aspirants.

Based on a survey that covered 90 per cent of doctorate-granting institutions, NSF reports that employment of scientists and engineers at US universities totaled about 306,500 in 1978, a 3 per cent increase from the previous year. "Although a 2 per cent increase in full-time S/E [scientists and engineers] accounted for most of the absolute increase, the Foundation states, "those employed on a part-time basis rose at a more rapid rate (7 per cent).

"There is some evidence," the analysis continues, "that many of these new 'hires' are outside the tenure track in higher education."

### Other findings:

- The 1977-78 growth "took place entirely in institutions offering graduate degrees. This may signify the end of a decade of expanding science and engineering employment in 2-year junior and community colleges."

- "The growth rate for women employed full-time at universities and colleges exceeded the increase for men in all S/E fields between 1977 and 1978. Women's relative share . . . however, remains nominal in all major disciplines . . . even so, academe compares favorably to other US economic sectors, with women accounting for 16 per cent of full-time S/E employment, while averaging 8 per cent nationally."

- "The expansion in employment in the life sciences was the largest, both in relative (4 per cent) and absolute terms . . . This represents a significant change from the 1973-77 period, during which the rate of growth of employment among life sciences fell behind all other disciplines. Most of the employment increases between 1977 and 1978 in the life sciences were centered in large universities with medical schools."

- "In 1978 . . . for the first time since 1973, the relative growth of the S/E population at private schools exceeded substantially that of publicly controlled institutions. According to the most recent data, private institutions have experienced a similar margin over public institutions in the rate of growth in the number of graduate science students. Between 1976 and 1977, graduate enrollments at private institutions grew at almost three times the rate for public institutions."

### Twenty leading universities and colleges employing full-time scientists and engineers: January 1977 and January 1978

Institution	Full-time scientists engineers		Percent change
	1977	1978	
<b>Total, all institutions . . . . .</b>	<b>235,859</b>	<b>241,099</b>	<b>2.2</b>
<b>20 leading institutions . . . . .</b>	<b>41,984</b>	<b>42,590</b>	<b>1.4</b>
1. Harvard Univ. . . . .	3,285	3,385	3.0
2. Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison . . . .	3,185	2,965	-6.9
3. Univ. of Minnesota . . . . .	2,890	2,901	.4
4. Univ. of Michigan . . . . .	2,677	2,728	1.9
5. Cornell Univ. . . . .	2,312	2,585	11.8
6. Ohio State Univ. . . . .	2,375	2,361	-.6
7. Texas A&M Univ. . . . .	2,012	2,072	3.0
8. Univ. of Illinois-Urbana . . . . .	2,074	2,046	-1.3
9. Massachusetts Inst. of Tech. . . . .	1,966	2,032	1.8
10. Johns Hopkins Univ. . . . .	1,990	1,991	.1
11. Univ. of Florida . . . . .	2,051	1,988	-3.1
12. Louisiana State Univ. System . . . .	1,885	1,978	4.9
13. Univ. of Washington . . . . .	1,947	1,964	.9
14. Pennsylvania State Univ. . . . .	1,873	1,903	1.6
15. Univ. of Texas at Austin . . . . .	1,670	1,680	.6
16. Purdue Univ.—All campuses . . . .	1,581	1,626	2.9
17. Yale Univ. . . . .	1,561	1,601	2.6
18. Michigan State Univ. . . . .	1,575	1,601	1.7
19. Univ. of Pittsburgh . . . . .	1,552	1,559	3.0
20. Stanford Univ. . . . .	1,493	1,584	6.1

SOURCE: National Science Foundation.

NSF offers no explanation for this shift, but one possible reason may be that the tuition differential between traditionally low-cost public and expensive private institutions is narrowing and the student traffic reflects this marketplace change.

The report, NSF 79-315, is a four-page summary derived from a previously published NSF study, *Detailed Statistical Tables: Human Resources for Scientific Activities at Universities and Colleges* (NSF 78-318). Both the summary and the *Tables* are available, without charge, from: Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.

## UNESCO Bibliography

Annotated bibliographies of current and backlist publications of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization are available without charge from UNESCO's American distributor. Order from: UNIPUB, 345 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10010; tel. (212) 686-4707.



## Nuclear Chief Tells How Not to Regulate

*The following is from an address, "The Nuclear Option: Did It Jump or Was It Pushed?" by Commissioner Peter Bradford of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 2, in East Lansing, Michigan:*

The essential element, it seems to me, in any regulatory system that reassures more than it regulates is that it have an immense capacity for self-delusion. Let me describe some of the elements of that capacity and leave it to you to decide whether they look familiar.

First, the agency's role must be heavily reactive and defined largely in terms of cases brought to it by those whom it regulates. It is helpful in this context if the relevant legislature and press have a strong tendency to evaluate the agency largely in terms of permits issued and rate cases processed.

Second, the agency's budget must be a tiny fraction (less than one percent) of the gross revenues of those whom it regulates. As a general rule, the total salaries of the Commissioners should not equal much more than half of the salary of the chief executive of the largest regulated entity.

Third, regulation should be on an "audit" basis, examining only a small fraction of the total number of accounts or plant designs or operating practices of the regulated entities.

Fourth, the system should deal with its critics more or less the way the tar baby dealt with B'r'er Rabbit. It should have an almost infinite capacity for repressive tolerance, the extending of exquisite procedural courtesy to participants who are never, in fact, allowed to get their hands on anything vital. This can be expected to frustrate critics to a point at which they become obsessed or shrill or demagogic or a little crazy. Then, of course, their arguments are more easily dismissed as obsessed, shrill, demagogic, or crazy, especially if others who had these characteristics all along have at some point been attracted into the fray.

Fifth, almost a corollary of the preceding point, intervenor funding of any substantial sort is to be avoided like the plague. Discovery and cross-examination must, of course, be allowed on some occasions, but the occasions can be limited and the examining boards must be constantly reminded of the need to keep the issues narrowly defined and the proceedings moving along. . . Embarrassing questions from other forums can sometimes be avoided by preemptive legislation such as that which denies the states any role in setting the standards for the radioactive exposures that their citizens will face. Proceedings themselves can often be selectively embarked upon under regulatory frameworks that allow

citizen petitions to languish for years while imposing firm deadlines on rate cases and licensing actions.

Sixth, the enforcement system must be a relatively benign one with only the most distant possibility of a truly severe penalty. Infractions or testimony that tend to mislead the regulatory agency in ways short of outright perjury are dealt with, if at all, under a lenient point system or with fines that bear only a trivial comparison to annual revenues unless the violator is unlucky enough to be quite small. Jail sentences should be available almost exclusively to those who disclose proprietary or classified or otherwise restricted information.

Seventh, though it is not essential, it is very helpful to have the system re-enforced by courts which defer copiously to agency expertise in the face of challenges from citizens groups, but which bow with equal fervor to management discretion or prerogatives in the face of challenges to the agency from the regulated entities. Should a Commissioner be overly rambunctious in publicly questioning the system as it works in particular instances, he can (as Chairman Pertschuk of the Federal Trade Commission recently was) be ordered to disqualify himself from further proceedings, though I think one would search a long time to find a case in which a Commissioner had been disqualified for a speech in glowing praise of a regulated technology.

Eighth, research programs that would actually test the validity of the underpinnings and hypotheses of the regulatory system are rarely, if ever, undertaken. This is ostensibly because they would be too costly. Policy evaluation offices are avoided, or hamstrung, or told what not to evaluate.

Ninth, it can also be expected that the regulated

*(Continued on Page 6)*

### Deutch in No. 3 DOE Post

John M. Deutch was sworn in on August 8 as Under Secretary of the Department of Energy—the number 3 spot in the agency.

Deutch joined DOE in October 1977 as Director of the Office of Energy Research and subsequently served as acting Assistant Secretary for Energy Technology and then as acting Under Secretary as DOE's upper echelons were riddled by ousters and resignations. Formerly chairman of MIT's Department of Chemistry, Deutch is said to be on the short list—along with White House Science Adviser Frank Press—as a candidate to succeed the retiring Jerome B. Wiesner as President of MIT.

## Transportation Plan Calls for Big R&D Boost

The Carter Administration last week issued a 10-year, \$16.5-billion "Transportation Energy Initiative" that includes a total of \$800 million in federal funds for a government-industry "Cooperative Automotive Research Program."

Given the fact that the Carter presidency is rapidly dissolving, such decade-long planning does invite some skepticism. And, maybe doubly so, since the plan calls for industry to kick in perhaps \$50 million a year, while the government's average of \$80 million a year is to be drawn—so says the plan—from the yet-to-be created Energy Security Trust Fund.

Nevertheless, even if this particular plan does not come into being, the main concept that it embodies—that research related to the auto has been neglected—is now so widely accepted that something along the lines of the so-called initiative is bound to happen in the next few years.

Tracing back to the call for industry to "reinvent the auto"—issued last February by the since-forced-out Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams—the research plan starts from the generally accepted premise that the automotive industry has been stingy about producing new knowledge. As an announcement put out by the Department of Transportation puts it, the proposed program "seeks to overcome decades of inattention to the need for replenishing the basic science and engineering foundations of automotive technology. It would develop a substantial body of basic research aimed at fundamentally improving automotive technology for the development of more fuel-efficient and socially acceptable automobiles during and beyond the 1990s."

The DOT announcement states an intention of "broadening the automotive research community," and adds that another aim is to train more automotive scientists and engineers. The research, it says, will involve "joint industry-government funding and planning" and will be conducted in academic, industrial, and federal laboratories.

As for disciplinary specifics, they include: thermal and fluid sciences, structural mechanics, electrochemistry, aerodynamics, materials science and processing, control systems, friction and wear, and acoustics and vibrations.

The administrative scheme for planning and carrying out these programs is, as might be expected, horrendously complex. In the words of the DOT announcement, "A planning staff headed by the Research and Special Programs Administrator of the Department of Transportation and including participants from the domestic automotive manufacturers, the Department of Energy, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and leading universities

is now formulating the cooperative plan. By September 15," the announcement goes on, "the planning staff will have completed the development of a government-industry agreement on funding, program management, entry and exit into (sic) the program, and clarification of roles of participants. By December 1, the technical program plan and budget requirements will be available." (If so, that would be one of the very few times that the detail-obsessed Carter Administration has been on time with any planning document.)

If the complexities of planning this program do not guarantee tardiness, it will almost certainly be provided by another feature of the preparatory process, of which DOT has the following to say:

"To facilitate interagency policy review of this automotive initiative, an Ad Hoc Committee on Automotive Research and Development of the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering and Technology has been established. The Committee is co-chaired by the Department of Transportation and the Office of Science and Technology Policy and also includes representatives

*(Continued on Page 7)*

### REGULATORY

*(Continued from Page 5)*

industries will utter frequent expressions of anguish at the toughness of the regulatory regime under which they labor. In this, they do run the risks of the boy who cried wolf in the event that they are ever face-to-face with a regulatory injustice so great that it outweighs the otherwise obvious advantages of the system I am describing. In fairness, one must acknowledge that this sometimes happens for regulation rarely encourages innovation, and an imaginative company will sometimes get stifled.

Tenth, the semantics that surround such a process are obviously critical to maintaining the illusions. Accidents become incidents; citizens become protest groups; ambiguous situations are held to offer "no evidence" of wrongdoing; parent holding company stockholders seek close identification with the widows and orphans who own stock in raising the bills of the many more who do not. Transfer payments from consumers or from subsidiaries to parents are labeled "taxes" for ratesetting purposes even when none of it actually goes to the Government. The efficiencies of the free enterprise system are constantly invoked despite the presence of only half of the competition—competition for capital—faced by companies which must deal in true free enterprise and compete with other suppliers of the same product for customers as well as financing.

## Another Round of Left and Right in \$25,000 Fermi Prize

The Fermi Award, that now-and-then big money prize that is usually divided between the right and left wings of the nuclear community, has followed form again this year, with \$25,000 apiece going to Harold Agnew and Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky.

Created in 1956 by the then-powerful but since abolished Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the award has been bestowed on such nuclear luminaries as Ernest O. Lawrence, Edward Teller, Hans Bethe, J. Robert Oppenheimer, and Hyman G. Rickover. In the past, the recipients were selected by the AEC's General Advisory Committee, which, through most of the Cold War, was one of the most powerful assemblages of senior scientific advice in the federal establishment. With both the AEC and the Advisory Committee gone, the prize-giving role has been inherited by the Department of Energy. According to a spokesman for that heap of administrative confusion, the selection process now consists of "getting recommendations from the scientific community," but she wasn't sure who got them, from whom, or how.

In any case, Agnew, who spent most of his career at the bomb-building Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, is a well-established nuclear hardliner. Since retiring from the Los Alamos directorship this year, he has been president and chief executive of the General Atomic Company.

Panofsky, director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, is a leading figure in the arms-control wing of the nuclear research community.

On weapons-related matters and dealings with the Soviets, the two Fermi winners are at opposite poles, which is in harmony with the balanced history of the prize.



The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has at last got around to amending its regulations so as to provide for the full-time presence of NRC inspectors at all nuclear-power reactors.

Among the purposes of the resident program, an NRC announcement stated, are "greater NRC inspector availability in the event of an accident."

## AUTOMOBILE

(Continued from Page 6)

from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Departments of Energy, Defense and Justice."

With all these provisions for providing reviews of reviews, there will be many, many meetings, memos and all that sort of activity that the bureaucratic set here is pleased to confuse with useful work. Meanwhile, there is no certainty that Congress will go along with Mr. Carter's plan for the Security Fund that's supposed to finance the federal portion of this scheme. Based on his controversial proposal for a windfall profit tax on the oil industry, the proposed Security Fund is being eyed by so many would-be beneficiaries that it's possible they'll simply neutralize each other.

Industry's part in financing this program is the subject of highly peculiar phraseology in the DOT announcement. "Based on preliminary understandings," says the Department, "federal funding for this planned program will be matched by the domestic automobile industry, at least up to \$50 million annually."

"At least up to!"

## In Print

Listed are recent publications of more than routine interest:

*The State of School Science*, report of a committee appointed by the National Academy of Sciences conglomerate to study science teaching in elementary and secondary schools; concludes that science teaching, along with much else at these educational levels, is in poor shape, and needs lots of help, including the establishment of "Science and Mathematics Teaching Resource Centers," more money from the National Science Foundation, and so forth. The study was chaired by Dael Wolfe, University of Washington. A "limited number of copies," available without charge, from: Commission on Human Resources, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20418.

*The State of the Environment in OECD Member Countries*, covers the 24 nations that make up the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and "traces changes in the quality of the environment during the past 10 years of environmental action in the OECD Member countries." Available in the US—\$10—from: OECD Publications and Information Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20006; tel. (202) 724-1857.

## Innovation Study Becalmed at the White House

Lost among the innumerable confusions of the Carter Administration is the matter of what was due when and for what purpose in connection with that vast examination of industrial innovation that got underway last year.

The study, formulated as a Domestic Policy Review—which means that it is a presidentially blessed super-review—was directed by Jordan Baruch, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in close collaboration with Frank Press, the White House Science Adviser, with a supporting cast of hundreds, if not thousands, drawn from industry, academe, government, and any other sector of society that could muster the fare to Washington.

Some distillate of the deliberations of all these folks was supposed to go to Carter's domestic policy chief, Stuart E. Eizenstat, at the beginning of April, but nothing did at that time. It was subsequently reported that Baruch was meeting weekly with Frank Press to boil things down a bit. Then it was said that some sort of report was completed, or nearly so, but that Mr. Carter was busy with the Middle East, then holed up at Camp David, and otherwise occupied.

In any case, the latest word is that the original Baruch

Report has been extensively condensed and consolidated, and that the Domestic Policy Review has now evolved to the point where another of Mr. Carter's paperwork institutions can be invoked—the Decision Memorandum. Prepared by Eizenstat and his staff people, this will list the various things that the President might do to spur innovation.

There are various reports as to when the Administration might have something to say publicly on the innovation issue, but there's nothing official, and at this writing, the matter is as vaporous as ever.

When the study was started, many people, including Baruch's predecessor at Commerce, Betsy Ancker-Johnson, said that impediments to innovation had been studied extensively and that further study would produce nothing new.

In his more modest moments, Baruch has been talking up the study as though it's destined to be a classic of modern economic and social analysis; Press tells of gaining important new insights into the problems of innovation. Meanwhile, along with a lot of this country's important business, the innovation study is becalmed in the White House.

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99  
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS  
300 N ZEEB RD  
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

3



